Reprehensible discrimination. No contact from you whatsoever. Reports Filed.

Inbox

James Wasil <james.wasil@gmail.com> Jun 19, 2025, 11:57 PM

to waltermanglona670

Walter,

Three weeks ago, I found myself cancelled on services after having the past 4 months of services approved.

Your office played telephone with me and spoke about me in my absence, and I was on the receiving end of a termination notice which should have been in error.

I would face discrimination with the explanation of this and ageism from a Federal Office: The Office of Aging.

All I have received was an "I'm sorry" notice and the admission of guilt, but you have done absolutely nothing to rectify this at all. Absolutely nothing.

I was cut off from services immediately and completely without any notice, and I had to find a way to borrow on my social security to make ends meet.

If not for my mother's help in securing a loan of $200 to get me through this month - which I would have to pay back somehow out-of-pocket, you would have let me starve without another word.

You would have "overlooked" it as you did in the case with my initial discrimination and ageism. This is a poorly run office, and as you are the director Walter Manglona for the Office of Aging, I clearly want and need answers immediately.

I am wanting a meeting with you to convene as soon as possible to help me sort this out and get to the bottom of this.

If you will maintain radio-silence as you did for the previous 3 weeks while I suffered in silence, I will go beyond the HHS and DOJ to get things resolved at the Federal level, which may result in your reduced or even eliminated funding once I begin this.

If you thought I would just "dry up and blow away" and nothing will come of it, you are mistaken.

After two weeks had gone by and you have done nothing about this nor call, I have already went ahead to report you to the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) which you will see here in a condensed email:

From OCR_Portal@nih.gov:

626309

Thank you for contacting the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office for Civil Rights (OCR). OCR enforces federal civil rights laws which prohibit discrimination in the delivery of health and human services based on race, color, national origin, disability, age, sex, religion, and the exercise of conscience, and also enforces the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) Privacy, Security and Breach Notification Rules.

Please do not fax, email, or mail a copy of this complaint to us as that may delay the processing of your complaint.

If you have any additional questions or need a reasonable accommodation, please contact OCR's Customer Response Center at 1-800-368-1019, Monday through Friday, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, ET.

[Message clipped]

And I made the report to the Department of Justice as well:

Thank you for submitting a report to the Civil Rights Division. Please save your record number for tracking. Your record number is: **624319-WSW**.

If you reported an incident where you or someone else has experienced or is still experiencing physical harm or violence, or are in immediate danger, please call 911 and contact the police.

What to Expect

1. We review your report

Our specialists in the Civil Rights Division carefully read every report to identify civil rights violations, spot trends, and deter... [Message Clipped]

So I mean business.

All you had to do was provide me a meal because I was disabled and only had one hand to work with. That is it. Instead, you kicked me while I was down. You played gossip like a high schooler to bash and to crucify a man over needing dinner, and every day after, he starved. Simply reprehensible. You should be ashamed of yourself. I am ashamed FOR YOU.

I hold you accountable Evelyn/Vivian, and Walter Manglona by surrogate for doing nothing about this.

From a the local level, I am very familiar with Chenchule' and the principles of inafa'maolek, and you have disgraced this on every level.

You say I don't meet your criteria of being manam'ko to be of the ranks of what constitutes this, but para u ayuda i taotao ni gaige gi kinalamten? What type of a Chamoru are you sir?

So I am requesting a face to face meeting. I know that it will be difficult regarding my aphasia and compounded with speech difficulties, but I will make the effort even still, because I want and need answers for this.

If I do not get them over the weekend and you choose to willfully ignore me even still, I have no choice but to escalate this further unless a resolve is made.

As I said, there may very well be reduced funding or elimination altogether of this, especially with Donald Trump and federal management going forward. I am not sure of what he is doing regarding this, so please be aware of that.

You can contact me immediately by calling 670-588-3249 or 330-942-2498 or schedule a time when we will meet.

Thank you,
James Wasil

Walt Manglona <waltermanglona670@gmail.com> Jun 20, 2025, 12:48 AM

to me

Dear Mr. Wasil,

I am saddened to hear about the difficulties you are currently experiencing. Please allow me to offer some clarification regarding your recent Home-Delivered Meals application with the DCCA Office on Aging.

Upon internal review, my staff discovered an administrative oversight during the initial screening process which inadvertently resulted in a premature approval of your application. After a more thorough evaluation, it was determined that you are 45 years of age. Regrettably, this disqualifies you from receiving services under the Home-Delivered Meals Program.

As mandated by our program guidelines and federal program requirements, eligibility for Home-Delivered Meals through the DCCA Office on Aging is restricted to individuals aged **60 or older** who are bedbound, are not able to prepare meals or shop on their own. Our programs are established to serve the **senior population** of our community, and while we deeply empathize with your situation, we are obligated to remain in strict compliance with these regulations.

I also understand that your prior correspondence was not directly addressed to me, which is why I had not responded personally until now. However, upon learning of your concern, I immediately conferred with my staff (Evelyn) and was assured that the reasoning behind the discontinuation of meal services was communicated to you at that time.

Please be assured that this decision was in no way discriminatory. Rather, it is a matter of adhering to established eligibility policy in accordance with our program's mission and mandate.

Even with the best of intentions, we are bound by the eligibility criteria, and unfortunately, **your current age precludes you from participation in this specific service**.

I hope this explanation has helped clarify the matter, and I sincerely wish you all the best in your continued endeavors. Should you need assistance identifying alternative community resources, we would be happy to refer you accordingly.

Kind regards,

Walter A. Manglona
Director
Office on Aging
Department of Community & Cultural Affairs

Phone: (670) 233-1321/22
Fax: (670) 233-1327
Website: http://www.dcca.gov.

The information contained in this email message may be privileged,confidential, and protected from disclosure. This message and accompanying documents are covered by the electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, and may contain confidential information intended for the specified individual(s) only. Any unauthorized use, printing, copying, disclosure, dissemination of or reliance upon this communication by persons other than the intended recipient may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. If you think that you have received this E-mail message in error, please reply to the sender and delete this email promptly.

James Wasil <james.wasil@gmail.com> Jun 20, 2025, 7:11 AM

to Walt

Dear Mr, Manglona,

Thank you for getting back to me promptly.

I would say it needs much clarification beyond what you have stated to me in your response.

You entirely overlooked the fact that I was discriminated against with regard to my disability and age. Such internal review needs revision, and changes need to be made accordingly, including accountability and reprimand notwithstanding.

You have cited correctly that I am age 45 rather than age 60. You have also cited that I have suffered a debilitating stroke, which has disabled me and would qualify me with the much needed services.

But you improperly cite the "age 60" requirement as the catch-all requirement for this, and ignore everything else which is being done with regard to it which wrong, grossly unfair, and illegal.

While the Office on Aging typically serves individuals aged 60 and older under the **Older Americans Act (OAA)**, this act ***also allows for services to be provided to individuals under 60 if they have a disability,*** *which* ***I DO.***

Furthermore, the **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) prohibits discrimination against individuals with disabilities by state and LOCAL government entities, regardless of AGE.**

This means **that a service cannot deny you access or cut off benefits solely due to your disability, even if you are "under age 60**", **especially if the service is available to others, which it IS.**

When your drivers say **"It is not for you, it is for them, because they are age 60, and you are age 59 and below"** ... and **you are delivering to my NEIGHBORS but NOT to me while watching me starve having me fend for myself with my disability in lieu of you receiving grant money to deny me everything** ... there could be no simpler example and explanation than that.

The **Age Discrimination Act of 1975** also prohibits age discrimination in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance.

Therefore Walter, your statement is incorrect because:

1) My **disability** is a protected characteristic.

2) The Office on Aging is receiving federal funds, must comply with the **ADA** and potentially parts of the **OAA** that **allow for disability-based service for those under 60**.

Therefore:

My age of 45 does NOT automatically exclude me from services, especially when my disability is the reason you need them in the first place and the program is federally funded.

At age 40 I am Federally protected by laws which you ignore in your response.

This is proven by the Federal Age Discrimination Act of 1975:
https://www.dol.gov/agencies/

(Title II)

Section 6102. Prohibition of discrimination

Pursuant to regulations prescribed under section 6103 of this title, and except as provided by section 6103(b) of this title and section 6103(c) of this title, no person in the United States shall, on the basis of age, be excluded from participation, in be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under, any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

The Age Discrimination Act of 1975 prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance. The Act, which applies to all ages, permits the use of certain age distinctions and factors other than age that meet the Act's requirements. The Age Discrimination Act is enforced by the Civil Rights Center.

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA) protects certain applicants and employees **_40 YEARS OF AGE AND OLDER_** from discrimination on the basis of age in hiring, promotion, discharge, compensation, or terms, conditions or privileges of employment. and disability.

You acknowledge that I am 45.

Federal law states that at 40 YEARS OF AGE AND AFTER that I would be protected, with 5 years to spare after having this stroke.

Case in point**: You refuse to grant me these things when Federal Law requires you to do so in order to receive funding.**

I am not getting the help that I need. You turn a blind eye to this, but take the money from it.

You are denying everything to me - even a simple daily meal, which is thinly based and veiled with the prejudices that you cite, while receiving federal funding for doing so.

I will challenge this accordingly with the DHS report and the DOJ as it is clear I AM being discriminated against on multiple fronts.

If it comes to this, I will seek legal action next.

I hope it does not come to this, but you are forcing my hand and catering to these prejudices rather than Federal law.

I await your response to this sir. Thank you.

Respectfully,
James Wasil

Walt Manglona <waltermanglona670@gmail.com> Jun 20, 2025, 8:29 AM

to **Evelyn**, **Matilde**, me

Good evening Mr. Wasil,

I hope all is well with you. As I stated earlier, the eligibility for the Home-Delivered Meals program under the CNMI Office on Aging is determined by federal guidelines designed to provide meals for homebound seniors aged 60 and older who meet the eligibility criteria.

These guidelines ensure that meals are directed toward supporting older adults who may face challenges in obtaining nutritious meals due to age-related limitations, disability, or isolation.

Unfortunately, individuals under the age of 60, do not meet the eligibility criteria for this program. It is important to emphasize that this is not a matter of personal judgment or discrimination, but rather adherence to our program's mandated requirements that govern how services are distributed.

We understand that each person’s circumstances are unique, and while we empathize with your situation, we are obligated to follow the policies that guide our program.

If you are in need of food assistance, we would be happy to connect you with other community resources or programs that may be better suited to your age group.

I appreciate your understanding.

Respectfully,

Walter A. Manglona
Director
Office on Aging
Department of Community & Cultural Affairs

Phone: (670) 233-1321/22
Fax: (670) 233-1327
Website: http://www.dcca.gov.

The information contained in this email message may be privileged,confidential, and protected from disclosure. This message and accompanying documents are covered by the electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, and may contain confidential information intended for the specified individual(s) only. Any unauthorized use, printing, copying, disclosure, dissemination of or reliance upon this communication by persons other than the intended recipient may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. If you think that you have received this E-mail message in error, please reply to the sender and delete this email promptly.

James Wasil <james.wasil@gmail.com> Jun 20, 2025, 9:37 AM

to Walt, Evelyn, Matilde

Dear Mr. Manglona,

Thank you again for your response. Unfortunately, your replies have failed to address the core legal issue I raised:

The denial of federally funded services to a disabled individual under 60 is not automatically justified by internal policy, and may in fact violate federal law.

Specifically:

- The **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)** prohibits exclusion from public services based on disability, especially when funded by federal dollars.
- The **Older Americans Act (OAA)** permits services to disabled individuals under 60 when appropriate.

- The **Age Discrimination Act of 1975** bars age-based exclusion from federally funded programs unless exceptions are explicitly defined and justified.

You have failed to respond to these legal points, nor have you provided any documentation showing that your program has an **approved federal waiver or exemption** allowing this form of exclusion.

I am requesting:

1. A written explanation of how your policies are reconciled with the ADA, OAA, and Age Discrimination Act.
2. A copy of your eligibility criteria, as filed with the federal funding agencies.
3. An internal review of this decision, given that I am a disabled adult who has been effectively denied access to nutrition services — which are provided to my neighbors — due to arbitrary age-based criteria.

If I do not receive an appropriate response within 10 business days, I will proceed on course (as I already have) with formal complaints to:

- The **U.S. Department of Justice (ADA Office)**
- The **Administration for Community Living (ACL) under HHS**
- The **Civil Rights Center at the Department of Labor**

Please understand this is not a personal matter, but a legal and ethical one. I sincerely hope the Office on Aging reconsiders its approach in alignment with its mandate to serve vulnerable members of the community.

Sincerely,
James Wasil

Walt Manglona <waltermanglona670@gmail.com> Jun 20, 2025, 4:42 PM

to me, Evelyn, Matilde

Dear Mr. Wasil,

Thank you for your message and for taking the time to articulate your concerns in detail. I want to begin by assuring you that your inquiry is being taken seriously and with the utmost respect for your rights and dignity.

Please allow me to clarify once again that the Home-Delivered Meals Program administered by the DCCA Office on Aging is governed by the Older Americans Act (OAA), which establishes specific eligibility guidelines for services funded under Title III of the Act. Under current federal guidance, Home-Delivered Meals are primarily designated for individuals aged 60 and older, as well as for certain categories of individuals under 60 in very limited circumstances such as those with disabilities who reside with an eligible older adult or are married to an eligible older adult.

We understand your reference to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and the OAA's intent to support individuals with disabilities. These laws are indeed designed to prevent unjust exclusion.

However, these protections do not require that all federal programs serve all age groups or abilities equally, particularly when eligibility criteria are set by Congress or federal agencies as a condition of funding. As such, it is not considered discriminatory when services are provided based on federally defined program parameters, so long as they are applied consistently and equitably, which we are committed to doing.

We recognize this may be deeply frustrating and acknowledge the importance of ensuring that no one falls through the cracks due to age or disability.

In response to your requests:

1. Policy Reconciliation: Our policies adhere to the eligibility criteria outlined in the Older Americans Act Title III-C, and we apply those standards consistently. Because services are age-targeted by federal statute, they do not constitute unlawful discrimination under the ADA or Age Discrimination Act.

2. Eligibility Documentation: I am happy to provide you with our program’s written eligibility criteria upon request.

3. Internal Review: We have initiated an internal review of your case, and our findings are that you do not meet the eligibility criteria for the Home-Delivered Meals program.

Please be assured that your advocacy is heard, and your perspective is respected.

We sincerely appreciate your engagement and will continue working to ensure that all community members, regardless of age or ability, are treated with fairness, empathy, and dignity.

With respect and appreciation,

Walter A. Manglona
Director
Office on Aging

Department of Community & Cultural Affairs

Phone: (670) 233-1321/22
Fax: (670) 233-1327
Website: http://www.dcca.gov.

The information contained in this email message may be privileged,confidential, and protected from disclosure. This message and accompanying documents are covered by the electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, and may contain confidential information intended for the specified individual(s) only. Any unauthorized use, printing, copying, disclosure, dissemination of or reliance upon this communication by persons other than the intended recipient may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. If you think that you have received this E-mail message in error, please reply to the sender and delete this email promptly.

James Wasil <james.wasil@gmail.com> Jun 20, 2025, 5:37 PM

to Walt, Evelyn, Matilde

Good morning Walter,

As I am reading this in the early morning, I am thinking that this is a **carefully lawyered non-apology** — meant to seem respectful and legally sound on the surface, but it's deeply evasive. Let me explain the reasons why:

1) Intentional Misinterpretation of Federal Law: You frame the **Older Americans Act (OAA)** as limiting *who* can be served — but that's misleading. The OAA allows for services to individuals *under 60* **with disabilities** in specific scenarios. Once again, reiterating as if it is a broken record, as if this time it will work? Instead of applying discretion or advocating for flexibility, you hide behind a narrow reading, and it is very unsettling.

2) Selective Legal Reasoning: You **acknowledge** the ADA and Age Discrimination Act and that they are there, only to dismiss them. This is a typical institutional defense. Aka: "Yes, those laws exist, but *we're allowed* to exclude you if we apply the rules *consistently* — even if it causes harm." That's not the spirit of the ADA or the Age Discrimination Act — both of which **exist to prevent exactly this kind of exclusion**, especially from public benefit programs using federal money.

3) Appealing to ‘Federal Guidelines’ Without Citing Them: You repeatedly reference “federal guidance” and "guidelines", but offer **no actual documentation** or links to guidance that explicitly bars someone like me. As if you're just hoping I will just accept that their hands are tied by this, when in fact, the OAA allows flexibility? Show me in black and white these guidelines, so I have a physical copy and chance to review them?

You thank me for my "engagement" and say you’re "heard”, but you still reaffirm your exclusion.

This is a tactical PR strategy - not a legal nor ethical one.

The bottom line is that If the **Office on Aging** receives **federal funds**, by you accepting the federal grant money, you **must** acknowledge comply with:

- The **ADA**, which bars disability-based exclusion from public services.
- The **Age Discrimination Act of 1975**, which bars unjust age-based exclusion in federally funded programs.
- **OAA Title III** includes **wiggle room** for individuals with disabilities... but you are choosing not to explore it.

This is what you are saying to me in essence:

"Yes, you’re suffering. Yes, you're disabled. Yes, you're under 60. Yes, you have expenses and that is tragic. But **we're allowed to deny you help** because the rules are designed for people older than you — and we’re not *required* to bend, even if you qualify under ADA or OAA exceptions, which you do, but again this will not be explored to make accommodation, and you are on your own to fend for yourself. I hope you survive?"

So while your position per se is *politically defensible*, is **not** immune to legal challenge.

I request the following from your office:

- The **actual federal guidance or citation** that prohibits a disabled 45-year-old from receiving meals.
- A copy of your **formal eligibility policy** in writing.

This will determine if you actually adhere to the "federal guidelines" verbatim...or if you rely on a narrow interpretation of them, thinking I will accept this and just make up these restrictions as you go and pass them as fact. I will request these documents in the following email to you.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

James Wasil

James Wasil <james.wasil@gmail.com> Jun 20, 2025, 5:42 PM

to Walt, Evelyn, Matilde

Walter, Thank you for your continued response.

To ensure transparency and compliance with applicable federal laws, I am formally requesting the following:

1. A copy of the ***written eligibility policy*** currently used by the CNMI Office on Aging to determine access to the Home-Delivered Meals program.

2. The ***specific federal statute, regulation, or administrative guidance*** you are citing that categorically disqualifies individuals under 60 with disabilities from accessing these services—particularly those who do not live with or are not married to someone over 60.

As I have stated previously, I am a 45-year-old individual with a documented disability due to stroke. The **Older Americans Act** allows for services to certain disabled individuals under 60. Furthermore, the **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)** and the **Age Discrimination Act of 1975** prohibit exclusion from federally funded programs based solely on age or disability.

I am requesting these documents to clarify whether your office is interpreting or applying federal eligibility criteria correctly and lawfully.

Please provide a written response within ten (10) business days.

This request is being logged for ongoing civil rights complaints filed with the U.S. Department of Justice, the Administration for Community Living (ACL), and the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) at the Department of Health and Human Services.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request.

Sincerely,
James Wasil

james.wasil@gmail.com

James Wasil <james.wasil@gmail.com> Jun 20, 2025, 5:50 PM

to **amy.wiatr-rodriguez**, **alice.kelsey**, **kathleen.votava**

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **James Wasil** <james.wasil@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Jun 20, 2025 at 5:42 PM
Subject: Re: Reprehensible discrimination. No contact from you whatsoever. Reports Filed.
To: Walt Manglona <waltermanglona670@gmail.com>
Cc: Evelyn Fleming-David <eflemingdavid@gmail.com>, Matilde Rosario <tilderosario@gmail.com>

Walter, Thank you for your continued response.

To ensure transparency and compliance with applicable federal laws, I am formally requesting the following:

1. A copy of the ***written eligibility policy*** currently used by the CNMI Office on Aging to determine access to the Home-Delivered Meals program.

2. The ***specific federal statute, regulation, or administrative guidance*** you are citing that categorically disqualifies individuals under 60 with disabilities from accessing these services—particularly those who do not live with or are not married to someone over 60.

As I have stated previously, I am a 45-year-old individual with a documented disability due to stroke. The **Older Americans Act** allows for services to certain disabled individuals under 60. Furthermore, the **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)** and the **Age Discrimination Act of 1975** prohibit exclusion from federally funded programs based solely on age or disability.

I am requesting these documents to clarify whether your office is interpreting or applying federal eligibility criteria correctly and lawfully.

Please provide a written response within ten (10) business days.

This request is being logged for ongoing civil rights complaints filed with the U.S. Department of Justice, the Administration for Community Living (ACL), and the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) at

the Department of Health and Human Services.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request.

Sincerely,
James Wasil

james.wasil@gmail.com

On Fri, Jun 20, 2025 at 5:37 PM James Wasil <james.wasil@gmail.com> wrote:

> Good morning Walter,
>
> As I am reading this in the early morning, I am thinking that this is a **carefully lawyered non-apology** — meant to seem respectful and legally sound on the surface, but it's deeply evasive. Let me explain the reasons why:
>
> **1) Intentional Misinterpretation of Federal Law:** You frame the **Older Americans Act (OAA)** as limiting *who* can be served — but that's misleading. The OAA allows for services to individuals *under 60* **with disabilities** in specific scenarios. Once again, reiterating as if it is a broken record, as if this time it will work? Instead of applying discretion or advocating for flexibility, you hide behind a narrow reading, and it is very unsettling.
>
> **2) Selective Legal Reasoning**: You **acknowledge** the ADA and Age Discrimination Act and that they are there, only to dismiss them. This is a typical institutional defense. Aka: "Yes, those laws exist, but *we're allowed* to exclude you if we apply the rules *consistently* — even if it causes harm." That's not the spirit of the ADA or the Age Discrimination Act — both of which **exist to prevent exactly this kind of exclusion**, especially from public benefit programs using federal money.
>
> **3) Appealing to 'Federal Guidelines' Without Citing Them:** You repeatedly reference "federal guidance" and "guidelines", but offer **no actual documentation** or links to guidance that explicitly bars someone like me. As if you're just hoping I will just accept that their hands are tied by this, when in fact, the OAA allows flexibility? Show me in black and white these guidelines, so I have a physical copy and chance to review them?
> You thank me for my "engagement" and say you're "heard", but you still reaffirm your exclusion.
>
> This is a tactical PR strategy - not a legal nor ethical one.
> The bottom line is that If the **Office on Aging** receives **federal funds**, by you accepting the federal grant money, you **must** acknowledge comply with:
>
> - The **ADA**, which bars disability-based exclusion from public services.
> - The **Age Discrimination Act of 1975**, which bars unjust age-based exclusion in federally funded programs.
> - **OAA Title III** includes **wiggle room** for individuals with disabilities... but you are choosing not to explore it.
>
> This is what you are saying to me in essence:
>
> "Yes, you're suffering. Yes, you're disabled. Yes, you're under 60. Yes, you have expenses and that is tragic. But **we're allowed to deny you help** because the rules are

designed for people older than you — and we're not *required* to bend, even if you qualify under ADA or OAA exceptions, which you do, but again this will not be explored to make accommodation, and you are on your own to fend for yourself. I hope you survive?"

So while your position per se is *politically defensible*, is **not** immune to legal challenge. I request the following from your office:

- The **actual federal guidance or citation** that prohibits a disabled 45-year-old from receiving meals.
- A copy of your **formal eligibility policy** in writing.

This will determine if you actually adhere to the "federal guidelines" verbatim...or if you rely on a narrow interpretation of them, thinking I will accept this and just make up these restrictions as you go and pass them as fact. I will request these documents in the following email to you.
Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,
James Wasil

On Fri, Jun 20, 2025 at 4:42 PM Walt Manglona <waltermanglona670@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear Mr. Wasil,

Thank you for your message and for taking the time to articulate your concerns in detail. I want to begin by assuring you that your inquiry is being taken seriously and with the utmost respect for your rights and dignity.

Please allow me to clarify once again that the Home-Delivered Meals Program administered by the DCCA Office on Aging is governed by the Older Americans Act (OAA), which establishes specific eligibility guidelines for services funded under Title III of the Act. Under current federal guidance, Home-Delivered Meals are primarily designated for individuals aged 60 and older, as well as for certain categories of individuals under 60 in very limited circumstances such as those with disabilities who reside with an eligible older adult or are married to an eligible older adult.

We understand your reference to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and the OAA's intent to support individuals with disabilities. These laws are indeed designed to prevent unjust exclusion.

However, these protections do not require that all federal programs serve all age groups or abilities equally, particularly when eligibility criteria are set by Congress or federal agencies as a condition of funding. As such, it is not considered discriminatory when services are provided based on federally defined program parameters, so long as they are applied consistently and equitably, which we are committed to doing.

We recognize this may be deeply frustrating and acknowledge the importance of ensuring that no one falls through the cracks due to age or disability.

In response to your requests:

1. Policy Reconciliation: Our policies adhere to the eligibility criteria outlined in the Older Americans Act Title III-C, and we apply those standards consistently. Because

services are age-targeted by federal statute, they do not constitute unlawful discrimination under the ADA or Age Discrimination Act.

2. Eligibility Documentation: I am happy to provide you with our program's written eligibility criteria upon request.

3. Internal Review: We have initiated an internal review of your case, and our findings are that you do not meet the eligibility criteria for the Home-Delivered Meals program.

Please be assured that your advocacy is heard, and your perspective is respected.

We sincerely appreciate your engagement and will continue working to ensure that all community members, regardless of age or ability, are treated with fairness, empathy, and dignity.

With respect and appreciation,

Walter A. Manglona
Director
Office on Aging
Department of Community & Cultural Affairs

Phone: (670) 233-1321/22
Fax: (670) 233-1327
Website: http://www.dcca.gov.

The information contained in this email message may be privileged,confidential, and protected from disclosure. This message and accompanying documents are covered by the electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, and may contain confidential information intended for the specified individual(s) only. Any unauthorized use, printing, copying, disclosure, dissemination of or reliance upon this communication by persons other than the intended recipient may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. If you think that you have received this E-mail message in error, please reply to the sender and delete this email promptly.

On Fri, Jun 20, 2025, 11:37 PM James Wasil <james.wasil@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear Mr. Manglona,
> Thank you again for your response. Unfortunately, your replies have failed to address the core legal issue I raised:
>
> *The denial of federally funded services to a disabled individual under 60 is not automatically justified by internal policy, and may in fact violate federal law.*
> Specifically:
>
> - The **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)** prohibits exclusion from public services based on disability, especially when funded by federal dollars.
> - The **Older Americans Act (OAA)** permits services to disabled individuals under 60 when appropriate.
> - The **Age Discrimination Act of 1975** bars age-based exclusion from federally funded programs unless exceptions are explicitly defined and justified.
>
> You have failed to respond to these legal points, nor have you provided any documentation showing that your program has an

approved federal waiver or exemption allowing this form of exclusion.
I am requesting:

1. A written explanation of how your policies are reconciled with the ADA, OAA, and Age Discrimination Act.
2. A copy of your eligibility criteria, as filed with the federal funding agencies.
3. An internal review of this decision, given that I am a disabled adult who has been effectively denied access to nutrition services — which are provided to my neighbors — due to arbitrary age-based criteria.

If I do not receive an appropriate response within 10 business days, I will proceed on course (as I already have) with formal complaints to:

- The **U.S. Department of Justice (ADA Office)**
- The **Administration for Community Living (ACL) under HHS**
- The **Civil Rights Center at the Department of Labor**

Please understand this is not a personal matter, but a legal and ethical one. I sincerely hope the Office on Aging reconsiders its approach in alignment with its mandate to serve vulnerable members of the community.
Sincerely,
James Wasil

On Fri, Jun 20, 2025 at 8:29 AM Walt Manglona <waltermanglona670@gmail.com> wrote:

> Good evening Mr. Wasil,
>
> I hope all is well with you. As I stated earlier, the eligibility for the Home-Delivered Meals program under the CNMI Office on Aging is determined by federal guidelines designed to provide meals for homebound seniors aged 60 and older who meet the eligibility criteria.
>
> These guidelines ensure that meals are directed toward supporting older adults who may face challenges in obtaining nutritious meals due to age-related limitations, disability, or isolation.
>
> Unfortunately, individuals under the age of 60, do not meet the eligibility criteria for this program. It is important to emphasize that this is not a matter of personal judgment or discrimination, but rather adherence to our program's mandated requirements that govern how services are distributed.
>
> We understand that each person’s circumstances are unique, and while we empathize with your situation, we are obligated to follow the policies that guide our program.
>
> If you are in need of food assistance, we would be happy to connect you with other community resources or programs that may be better suited to your age group.
>
> I appreciate your understanding.

Respectfully,

Walter A. Manglona
Director
Office on Aging
Department of Community & Cultural Affairs

Phone: (670) 233-1321/22
Fax: (670) 233-1327
Website: http://www.dcca.gov.

The information contained in this email message may be privileged,confidential, and protected from disclosure. This message and accompanying documents are covered by the electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, and may contain confidential information intended for the specified individual(s) only. Any unauthorized use, printing, copying, disclosure, dissemination of or reliance upon this communication by persons other than the intended recipient may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. If you think that you have received this E-mail message in error, please reply to the sender and delete this email promptly.

On Fri, Jun 20, 2025, 9:11 PM James Wasil <james.wasil@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear Mr, Manglona,
> Thank you for getting back to me promptly.
> I would say it needs much clarification beyond what you have stated to me in your response.
>
> You entirely overlooked the fact that I was discriminated against with regard to my disability and age. Such internal review needs revision, and changes need to be made accordingly, including accountability and reprimand notwithstanding.
>
> You have cited correctly that I am age 45 rather than age 60. You have also cited that I have suffered a debilitating stroke, which has disabled me and would qualify me with the much needed services.
>
> But you improperly cite the "age 60" requirement as the catch-all requirement for this, and ignore everything else which is being done with regard to it which wrong, grossly unfair, and illegal.
>
> While the Office on Aging typically serves individuals aged 60 and older under the **Older Americans Act (OAA)**, this act ***also allows for services to be provided to individuals under 60 if they have a disability,*** *which* ***I DO.***
>
> Furthermore, the **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) prohibits discrimination against individuals with disabilities by state and LOCAL government entities, regardless of AGE.**
>
> This means **that a service cannot deny you access or cut off benefits solely due to your disability, even if you are "under age 60", especially if the service is available to others, which it IS.**
>
> When your drivers say **"It is not for you, it is for them, because they are age 60, and you are age 59 and below"** ... and **you are delivering to my NEIGHBORS but NOT**

to me while watching me starve having me fend for myself with my disability in lieu of you receiving grant money to deny me everything ... there could be no simpler example and explanation than that.

The **Age Discrimination Act of 1975** also prohibits age discrimination in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance.

Therefore Walter, your statement is incorrect because:
1) My **disability** is a protected characteristic.

2) The Office on Aging is receiving federal funds, must comply with the **ADA** and potentially parts of the **OAA** that **allow for disability-based service for those under 60**.
Therefore:

My age of 45 does NOT automatically exclude me from services, especially when my disability is the reason you need them in the first place and the program is federally funded.

At age 40 I am Federally protected by laws which you ignore in your response.
This is proven by the Federal Age Discrimination Act of 1975:
https://www.dol.gov/agencies/

(Title II)

Section 6102. Prohibition of discrimination
Pursuant to regulations prescribed under section 6103 of this title, and except as provided by section 6103(b) of this title and section 6103(c) of this title, no person in the United States shall, on the basis of age, be excluded from participation, in be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under, any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

The Age Discrimination Act of 1975 prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance. The Act, which applies to all ages, permits the use of certain age distinctions and factors

other than age that meet the Act's requirements. The Age Discrimination Act is enforced by the Civil Rights Center.
The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA) protects certain applicants and employees **_40 YEARS OF AGE AND OLDER_** from discrimination on the basis of age in hiring, promotion, discharge, compensation, or terms, conditions or privileges of employment. and disability.
You acknowledge that I am 45.

Federal law states that at 40 YEARS OF AGE AND AFTER that I would be protected, with 5 years to spare after having this stroke.

Case in point**: You refuse to grant me these things when Federal Law requires you to do so in order to receive funding.**

I am not getting the help that I need. You turn a blind eye to this, but take the money from it.

You are denying everything to me - even a simple daily meal, which is thinly based and veiled with the prejudices that you cite, while receiving federal funding for doing so.

I will challenge this accordingly with the DHS report and the DOJ as it is clear I AM being discriminated against on multiple fronts.

If it comes to this, I will seek legal action next.
I hope it does not come to this, but you are forcing my hand and catering to these prejudices rather than Federal law.
I await your response to this sir. Thank you.

Respectfully,
James Wasil

On Fri, Jun 20, 2025 at 12:48 AM Walt Manglona <waltermanglona670@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Wasil,

I am saddened to hear about the difficulties you are currently experiencing. Please allow me to offer some clarification regarding your recent Home-Delivered Meals application with the DCCA Office on Aging.

Upon internal review, my staff discovered an administrative oversight during the initial screening process which inadvertently resulted in a premature approval of your application. After a more thorough evaluation, it was determined that you are 45 years of age. Regrettably, this disqualifies you from receiving services under the Home-Delivered Meals Program.

As mandated by our program guidelines and federal program requirements, eligibility for Home-Delivered Meals through the DCCA Office on Aging is restricted to individuals aged **60 or older** who are bedbound, are not able to prepare meals or shop on their own. Our programs are established to serve the **senior population** of our community, and while we deeply empathize with your situation, we are obligated to remain in strict compliance with these regulations.

I also understand that your prior correspondence was not directly addressed to me, which is why I had not responded personally until now. However, upon learning of your concern, I immediately conferred with my staff (Evelyn) and was assured that the reasoning behind the discontinuation of meal services was communicated to you at that time.

Please be assured that this decision was in no way discriminatory. Rather, it is a matter of adhering to established eligibility policy in accordance with our program's mission and mandate.

Even with the best of intentions, we are bound by the eligibility criteria, and unfortunately, **your current age precludes you from participation in this specific service**.

I hope this explanation has helped clarify the matter, and I sincerely wish you all the best in your continued endeavors. Should you need assistance identifying alternative community resources, we would be happy to refer you accordingly.

Kind regards,

Walter A. Manglona
Director
Office on Aging
Department of Community & Cultural Affairs

Phone: (670) 233-1321/22
Fax: (670) 233-1327
Website: http://www.dcca.gov.

The information contained in this email message may be privileged,confidential, and protected from disclosure. This message and accompanying documents are covered by the electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, and may contain confidential information intended for the specified individual(s) only. Any unauthorized use, printing, copying, disclosure, dissemination of or reliance upon this communication by persons other than the intended recipient may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. If you think that you have received this E-mail message in error, please reply to the sender and delete this email promptly.

On Fri, Jun 20, 2025 at 1:57 PM James Wasil <james.wasil@gmail.com> wrote:

Walter,

Three weeks ago, I found myself cancelled on services after having the past 4 months of services approved.

Your office played telephone with me and spoke about me in my absence, and I was on the receiving end of a termination notice which should have been in error.

I would face discrimination with the explanation of this and ageism from a Federal Office: The Office of Aging.

All I have received was an "I'm sorry" notice and the admission of guilt, but you have done absolutely nothing to rectify this at all. Absolutely nothing.
I was cut off from services immediately and completely without any notice, and I had to find a way to borrow on my social security to make ends meet.

If not for my mother's help in securing a loan of $200 to get me through this month - which I would have to pay back somehow out-of-pocket, you would have let me starve without another word.

You would have "overlooked" it as you did in the case with my initial discrimination and ageism. This is a poorly run office, and as you are the director Walter Manglona for the Office of Aging, I clearly want and need answers immediately.

I am wanting a meeting with you to convene as soon as possible to help me sort this out and get to the bottom of this.
If you will maintain radio-silence as you did for the previous 3 weeks while I suffered in silence, I will go beyond the HHS and DOJ to get things resolved at the Federal level, which may result in your reduced or even eliminated funding once I begin this.
If you thought I would just "dry up and blow away" and nothing will come of it, you are mistaken.

After two weeks had gone by and you have done nothing about this nor call, I have already went ahead to report you to the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) which you will see here in a condensed email:
From OCR_Portal@nih.gov:

626309

Thank you for contacting the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office for Civil Rights (OCR). OCR enforces federal civil rights laws which prohibit discrimination in the delivery of health and human services based on race, color, national origin, disability, age, sex, religion, and the exercise of conscience, and also enforces the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) Privacy, Security and Breach Notification Rules.

Please do not fax, email, or mail a copy of this complaint to us as that may delay the processing of your complaint.

If you have any additional questions or need a reasonable accommodation, please contact OCR’s Customer Response Center at 1-800-368-1019, Monday through Friday, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, ET.

[Message clipped]

And I made the report to the Department of Justice as well:

Thank you for submitting a report to the Civil Rights Division. Please save your record number for tracking. Your record number is: **624319-WSW**.
If you reported an incident where you or someone else has experienced or is still experiencing physical harm or violence, or are in immediate danger, please call 911 and contact the police.

What to Expect

1. We review your report

Our specialists in the Civil Rights Division carefully read every report to identify civil rights violations, spot trends, and deter... [Message Clipped]

So I mean business.
All you had to do was provide me a meal because I was disabled and only had one hand to work with. That is it. Instead, you kicked me while I was down. You played gossip like a high schooler to bash and to crucify a man over needing dinner, and every day after, he starved. Simply reprehensible. You should be ashamed of yourself. I am ashamed FOR YOU.

I hold you accountable Evelyn/Vivian, and Walter Manglona by surrogate for doing nothing about this.

From a the local level, I am very familiar with Chenchule' and the principles of inafa'maolek, and you have disgraced this on every level.

You say I don't meet your criteria of being manam'ko to be of the ranks of what constitutes this, but para u ayuda i taotao ni gaige gi kinalamten? What type of a Chamoru are you sir?
So I am requesting a face to face meeting. I know that it will be difficult regarding my aphasia and compounded with speech difficulties, but I will make the effort even still, because I want and need answers for this.
If I do not get them over the weekend and you choose to willfully ignore me even still, I have no choice but to escalate this further unless a resolve is made.

As I said, there may very well be reduced funding or elimination altogether of this, especially with Donald Trump and federal management going forward. I am not sure of what he is doing regarding this, so please be aware of that.
You can contact me immediately by calling 670-588-3249 or 330-942-2498 or schedule a time when we will meet.
Thank you,
James Wasil

Walt Manglona <waltermanglona670@gmail.com> Jun 21, 2025, 6:37 AM

to **Evelyn**, **Matilde**, me

Good evening Mr. Wasil,

Thank you for your continued engagement and for taking the time to express your concerns in detail. We appreciate the opportunity to clarify the policies and procedures of the CNMI Office on Aging with regard to the Home-Delivered Meals Program.
The Home-Delivered Meals Program, as administered under Title III of the Older Americans Act (OAA), is specifically designed to serve individuals 60 years of age or older who are homebound due to illness, disability, or isolation. This includes seniors who are unable to leave their homes

unassisted, who have difficulty preparing meals, or who would otherwise be at risk of malnutrition. The program also extends services to spouses of eligible participants and live-in caregivers who themselves are aged 60 or older, regardless of their own health status.

After careful and thorough review of your application, we must respectfully inform you that you do not meet our program's eligibility criteria required for participation in this program.

Specifically, your age (45) does not satisfy the baseline statutory requirement of being 60 years or older under the OAA's Title III nutrition programs. While the Act does contain limited provisions under Title III and Title VI for individuals under 60 in specific caregiving or cohabiting circumstances, none of those exceptions apply in your case.

In response to your specific request:

Attached you will find the written eligibility policy used by the CNMI Office on Aging to determine access to the Home-Delivered Meals Program.

The eligibility criteria are governed by 42 U.S.C. § 3030g-21 (Title III-C of the Older Americans Act) and further clarified in guidance from the Administration for Community Living (ACL). These statutes do not authorize categorical inclusion of individuals under 60 unless they are spouses or co-residing caregivers of eligible homebound seniors.

Regarding your reference to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, we fully agree that no individual should be excluded from federally funded services on the basis of age or disability where such inclusion is authorized under law. However, it is equally important to understand that eligibility restrictions enacted by Congress do not constitute unlawful discrimination, particularly when those restrictions are clearly defined in the statutory framework of the authorizing program. Federal laws such as the ADA do not override age-based eligibility requirements written into the Older Americans Act.

To be clear: the denial of your request is not a matter of internal policy discretion, but one of federal statutory compliance. We have no authority to extend services beyond the scope of what is legally permitted under the OAA.

We recognize that this outcome may be disappointing. In our commitment to supporting the broader needs of the community, we would be happy to connect you with alternative support programs for which you may qualify, including the Nutrition Assistance Program (NAP) or services available through charitable non-profit organizations on the island.

At this time, we must respectfully conclude that we are unable to proceed further with your request under the Home-Delivered Meals Program. We understand that you have chosen to escalate this matter to federal oversight bodies, and we welcome any appropriate review as part of our commitment to transparency and compliance.

We appreciate your understanding and trust you will find the attached materials helpful. Thank you for your understanding.

Respectfully,

Walter A. Manglona
Director
Office on Aging
Department of Community & Cultural Affairs

Phone: (670) 233-1321/22
Fax: (670) 233-1327
Website: http://www.dcca.gov.

The information contained in this email message may be privileged,confidential, and protected from disclosure. This message and accompanying documents are covered by the electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, and may contain confidential information intended for the specified individual(s) only. Any unauthorized use, printing, copying, disclosure, dissemination of or reliance upon this communication by persons other than the intended recipient may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. If you think that you have received this E-mail message in error, please reply to the sender and delete this email promptly.

2 Attachments • Scanned by Gmail

James Wasil <james.wasil@gmail.com> Jun 21, 2025, 9:03 AM

to Walt, Evelyn, Matilde

Dear Mr. Manglona,

In your most recent response, it reflects a shift from vague dismissal to outright legal entrenchment — using technical language, selective statute references, and bureaucratic polish. But rather than justify accessibility or compassion, your response aims only to **justify denial**.

This is the behavior of institutions that know the **optics are poor** but believe the law shields them from responsibility.

You invoke Title III of the Older Americans Act (OAA) while **ignoring the broader intent of the law** — the inclusion of at-risk individuals, including younger persons with disabilities. That's not accidental. It's strategic.

You stated:

> "The ADA doesn't override age-based restrictions…"

That stance is legally debatable. The ADA does not need to "override" anything — it operates **in parallel** to guarantee **equal access** to services funded by federal dollars. The fact that you're receiving such funding, while excluding me solely based on age, is not neutral — it is exclusionary.

You wrote:

> "We welcome oversight review…"

Respectfully, that reads less as cooperation and more as a **calculated bet** that oversight agencies will not act. But discrimination — particularly when federally funded — is **never minor**. It will be reviewed. I trust that oversight bodies will see this for what it is.

You also wrote:

> "We attached our policy, so we've complied."

Technically, yes — but to what end? That compliance has been **weaponized to justify exclusion**, while I, a disabled individual, am left without access to basic services offered to my neighbors. This is, in effect, the legal equivalent of "just following orders."

What your response really says is:

> "Yes, you're disabled. Yes, this harms you. But we believe we're technically allowed to exclude you, so we will — even as we deliver meals next door."

That isn't just bureaucratic. It's **immoral**.

Even if you claim "compliance" with a narrow reading of OAA Title III, the **total exclusion** of people like me (under 60, disabled) **raises civil rights red flags** under both:

- **The ADA (Title II)** – State and local governments **cannot deny equal benefit** of public services to people with disabilities.
- **The Age Discrimination Act of 1975** – Prohibits **age-based exclusion** in federally funded programs unless age is a necessary and proven criterion.

In my specific case:

- I am disabled and protected under the **ADA**.
- I am age 45, and protected under the **Age Discrimination Act**.
- I have **no access** to the same meals being given to **able-bodied 60-year-olds** next door.

That is the very definition of **discriminatory impact**.

Your office is refusing to accommodate a disabled individual, interpreting the OAA in a way that excludes vulnerable populations without offering **any comparable service**, and doing so under the guise of legal compliance. Your interpretation, though polished, **causes harm** — and I am living proof of that harm.

I am not asking for an exception. I am asking for **equal access under the law**. I am not asking you to rewrite the OAA — I am asking that **the ADA and Age Discrimination Act be enforced alongside it**, as Congress intended.

So yes, you can quote statutes. But let's be clear:

- **Statutes are not shields against discrimination.**
- **Policy compliance does not excuse exclusion.**
- And **justice does not belong only to those over 60.**

I will be forwarding this exchange and your attached materials to the **Department of Justice, Administration for Community Living, and the Office for Civil Rights** for further review. I am requesting that they initiate a full audit of the CNMI Office on Aging's use of federal funds and whether your program implementation violates federal nondiscrimination mandates — particularly for **disabled individuals under 60**.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
James Wasil

James Wasil Jun 21, 2025, 9:06 AM

---------- Forwarded message --------- From: James Wasil <james.wasil@gmail.com> Date: Sat, Jun 21, 2025 at 9:03 AM Subject: Re: Reprehensible discrimination. N

Walt Manglona <waltermanglona670@gmail.com> Jun 21, 2025, 9:35 AM

to **Evelyn**, **Matilde**, me

Good evening Mr. Wasil,

Thank you for your email. I'd like to kindly reiterate that eligibility for our Home-Delivered Meals Program is based on the guidelines set forth by the Older Americans Act, which provides services for individuals aged 60 and older. As you are 45 years old, you do not meet the age-based eligibility criteria for this program.

Please understand that this decision is not discriminatory, but a requirement of the program's legal framework. Please review our eligibility guidelines that I provided in my previous email. It clearly states what the eligibility criterias are, for your reference.

Please note that we have considered all the information you have provided. However, base on your application, we have determined that you are not eligible for the home-delivered meals program.

To avoid redundancy, I kindly refer you back to my previous emails, where I explained in detail why you are not eligible for the home- delivered meals program.

Our decision is based solely on the eligibility criteria set by the program, which we are required to follow.

Thank you for your understanding.

Sincerely,

Walter A. Manglona
Director
Office on Aging
Department of Community & Cultural Affairs

Phone: (670) 233-1321/22
Fax: (670) 233-1327
Website: http://www.dcca.gov.

The information contained in this email message may be privileged,confidential, and protected from disclosure. This message and accompanying documents are covered by the electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, and may contain confidential information intended for the specified individual(s) only. Any unauthorized use, printing, copying, disclosure, dissemination of or reliance upon this communication by persons other than the intended recipient may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. If you think that you have received this E-mail message in error, please reply to the sender and delete this email promptly.

James Wasil <james.wasil@gmail.com> Jun 21, 2025, 12:54 PM

to **ada.complaint**, **amy.wiatr-rodriguez**, **kathleen.votava**, **alice.kelsey**

Final thoughts on this is that he honestly does not deserve to be in a position to be making decisions much less control the federal funds that are being delegated to it.

In a stonewall attempt, he completely sidesteps my points about federal anti-discrimination laws and federal guidelines, and never even naming them this time. Tactical omission. He keeps invoking the OAA's 60+ requirement, without addressing how ADA and Age Discrimination protections apply to federally funded programs, including those with age targets.

The ADA doesn't get overridden by the OAA — both must operate in tandem, which is exactly the point Walter keeps dodging in order that he receive federal funding in his Saipan CNMI Office of Aging, while he is satisfied with discriminating against me while pretending that he isn't and leaving me destitute and without any help or care post-stroke.

With Walter’s refusal to engage with those points, it further reinforces my claim that they have knowingly and willfully refused to accommodate a disabled person under 60, while continuing to accept Federal funds intended to serve at-risk individuals.

If I am not being helped, then where is the money being funneled to?!

I sincerely hope that you will look into this discrimination and address the situation properly, as I have no one else to turn to going forward.

Thank you,
James Wasil

Tel: 670-588-3249 / 330-942-2498
Email: james.wasil@gmail.com